

**REMARKS**

In this reply, Applicants amend claims 1, 5, 6, 12, 20, and 21. Claims 1-3, 5-12, and 14-21 are currently pending. The changes to the claims are supported by the originally-filed application. No new matter has been added.

In the outstanding Final Office Action, claims 1-3, 5-12, and 14-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maeda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,785,487, "Maeda") in view of Bodnar (U.S. Patent No. 6,544,295, "Bodnar"); and claims 20 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maeda in view of Bodnar, and further in view of Funaki (U.S. Patent No. 6,707,471, "Funaki").

In response to the rejection of claims 1-3, 5-12, and 14-19 as being unpatentable over Maeda in view of Bodnar, Applicants amend independent claim 1 to more specifically recite the "multi-function" nature of the claimed OK button. Thus, Applicants amend independent claim 1 to recite "a multi-function OK button . . . configured to perform at least two functions when the multi-function OK button receives an input, the at least two functions including enabling the inputted setting of the image forming condition and displaying a shortcut button for redisplaying the setting screen on which the image forming condition was set." Along the same lines, Applicants amend independent claim 12 to recite "performing, when the OK button receives an input, at least a first function of enabling the inputted setting of the image forming condition and a second function of displaying a shortcut button for redisplaying the setting screen on which the image forming condition was set."

Applicants respectfully submit that Maeda and Bodnar, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest at least these features of amended independent claims 1 and 12.

First, Maeda does not teach or suggest any OK button at all, much less an OK button “configured to perform at least two functions . . . including enabling the inputted setting of the image forming condition and displaying a shortcut button for redisplaying the setting screen on which the image forming condition was set,” as recited in claim 1. Indeed, the Office Action concedes at pages 2 and 6 that Maeda does not disclose “an OK button for enabling the setting of the image forming condition” and “receiving an input to operate an OK button so as to display a short cut button on the initial screen and enable the setting of the image forming condition inputted on the setting screen.” For the same reason, Maeda also does not teach or suggest “performing, when the OK button receives an input, at least a first function of enabling the inputted setting of the image forming condition and a second function of displaying a shortcut button for redisplaying the setting screen on which the image forming condition was set,” as recited in claim 12.

Second, Bodnar also does not teach or suggest these features of amended independent claims 1 and 12 not taught or suggested by Maeda. Applicants note that the Office Action asserts at pages 2-3 that “Bodnar discloses . . . an OK button for creating a shortcut represented by an icon on an initial screen (column 11, lines 25-45).” However, Bodnar only discloses that “[t]he user clicks OK in the Create Internet Shortcut dialog box” and that this “creates [an Internet Shortcut], represented by an icon, which appears on the user’s desktop” (c. 11, ll. 28-31). Moreover, a person of

ordinary skill in the art would know that upon clicking on an Internet Shortcut icon, one merely opens in a browser an Internet webpage. But opening a webpage is not “redisplaying the setting screen on which the *image forming condition* was set,” as recited in claims 1 and 12. In particular, Bodnar’s website is merely opened, not “redisplay[ed],” and a website has nothing to do with an “image forming condition.” Furthermore, Bodnar explains that the Internet Shortcut is created by “right-click[ing] a Web site,” “select[ing] ‘Internet Shortcut’ from the pop-up menu,” and “click[ing] OK in the Create Internet Shortcut dialog box” (c. 11, ll. 26-29). Thus, even if Bodnar discloses an “OK button” that creates an Internet Shortcut, that button is not a “multi-function OK button” but merely a single-function button that only creates an Internet Shortcut icon and performs no other function.

Finally, Applicants further note that the Advisory Action states in the continuation sheet that “[w]hen the OK button is selected in Bodnar, the inputted setting of the image forming is enabled through the confirmation of a selection which creates a shortcut,” that “Maeda discloses a user may input a setting, and by pressing a close button, the setting is enabled on the initial screen,” and that Bodnar’s alleged “OK button . . . confirm[ing] the creation of a shortcut” cures the deficiencies of Maeda. Applicants respectfully disagree. As discussed above, Meada does not teach any OK button. And even if Maeda’s alleged “close button” were construed as an OK button, arguendo, that button is not “a shortcut button for redisplaying the setting screen on which the image forming condition was set.” As to Bodnar, even if it discloses a button creating a shortcut, that shortcut is to a website and is in no way for redisplaying the setting screen on which the image forming condition was set. In addition, even if one were to

incorporate Bodnar's button creating a shortcut in Maeda, arguendo, there would be no reason, absent improper hindsight, to have a single button perform the functions of Maeda's close button and Bodnar's shortcut-creating button. Rather, one would simply use two single-function buttons, consistent with the single-function nature of Bodnar's short-cut creating button, whose sole function is to create a shortcut icon. Thus, Maeda and Bodnar, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest at least the OK button features of amended independent claims 1 and 12.

Therefore, whether taken alone or in combination, Maeda and Bodnar fail to teach or suggest all the features of independent claims 1 and 12. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of the rejection of independent claims 1 and 12 and their dependent claims 2, 3, 5-11, and 14-19 as being unpatentable over Maeda in view of Bodnar.

In response to the rejection of claims 20 and 21 as being unpatentable over Maeda in view of Bodnar, and further in view of Funaki, Applicants submit that Funaki fails to teach or suggest the aforementioned features of independent claims 1 and 12 not taught or suggested by Maeda and Bodnar, and further submit that Maeda, Bodnar, and Funaki fail to teach or suggest the additional features recited in amended independent claims 20 and 21. Therefore, whether taken alone or in combination, Maeda, Bodnar, and Funaki fail to teach or suggest all the features of dependent claims 20 and 21. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of the rejection of claims 20 and 21 as being unpatentable over Maeda in view of Bodnar, and further in view of Funaki.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants submit that this claimed invention is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the prior art. Applicants therefore request favorable reconsideration and reexamination of the application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Because the Office Action contains characterizations of the claims and prior art with which Applicants do not necessarily agree, Applicants decline to subscribe to any such characterizations unless expressly set forth in this paper.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to Deposit Account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: November 6, 2008

By: /David W. Hill/  
David W. Hill  
Reg. No. 28,220